

- De Bono, E. (1983). The Direct Teaching of Thinking as a Skill. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(10), 703-8.

“They may show cleverness but not wisdom.” This article highlights the idea that if we want students to become critical thinkers they must first learn how to think. I found this article beneficial because previous articles emphasized that the success of inquiry based learning relies heavily on previous knowledge. This article is stating that a student may be smart and have a lot of previous knowledge, but if he doesn’t know how to think and use this previous knowledge it will not be beneficial.

- Sawyer, R. J., Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (1992). Direct teaching, strategy instruction, and strategy instruction with explicit self-regulation: Effects on the composition skills and self-efficacy of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of educational psychology*, 84(3), 340.

In this study, researchers looked at 4 different teaching methods and the effect that each method had on self-efficacy and writing skills. Researchers found that when you are using a method other than direct teaching, the longer the strategy is implemented the more beneficial it will be. Therefore, testing a IBL class for two weeks will not show the full effect of inquiry based learning. Studies may have to be designed to focus on a longer period of time to show significant effects.

- Zohar, A., & Aharon-Kravetsky, S. (2005). Exploring the effects of cognitive conflict and direct teaching for students of different academic levels. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42(7), 829-855.

This study did not specifically look at inquiry based learning but it did compare cognitive conflict and direct teaching. The study focused on students with high academic levels and low academic levels. Results showed that students at a higher academic level benefit more from a

cognitive conflict teaching method that in a direct teaching setting. Students at a low academic level benefited more in a direct teaching setting. This shows that direct teaching may not push the higher students but should not be taken out of schools because it is still beneficial to others.

- Slaughter, H. (1988). Indirect and Direct Teaching in a Whole Language Program. *The Reading Teacher*, 42(1), 30-34. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.wexler.hunter.cuny.edu/stable/20199998>

In this article, the author showed that both direct and indirect teaching methods can coexist in a classroom. The article speaks on why including both methods are beneficial and how to effectively use both methods in a literacy classroom. In this study the methods were used in a Whole Language classroom. Can indirect and direct teaching methods co-exist in different subject areas other than literacy?

- Bay, M., Staver, J. R., Bryan, T., & Hale, J. B. (1992). Science instruction for the mildly handicapped: Direct instruction versus discovery teaching. *Journal of research in science teaching*, 29(6), 555-570.

This research was conducted on mildly handicapped and non handicapped students. The students were split into either a direct instruction setting or a discovery teaching setting. Research found that non handicapped students from both setting performed the same on a posttest, however the students from the discovery group performed higher on a retention test than students in a direct instruction setting. This supports the idea that discovery learning is beneficial because students are not only thinking more critically in this setting, but they are processing information in a way that allows them to use this new information in the future.